

DH-001

REMARKS:**Status**

All previously pending claims have been cancelled, and new method claims 23 to 41 have been added. Claim 23 is the sole pending independent claim.

Withdrawal of Claims by Office Action and Required Corrections

The Office Action withdrew claims 21 to 22 as being directed to "a method group (Group 1)." These claims have been cancelled. However, Applicant respectfully points out that nothing bars claiming both an apparatus and a method for using that apparatus in a single application.

In this regard, MPEP § 806.05(e) states that "[p]rocess and apparatus for its practice can be shown to be distinct inventions, if either or both of the following can be shown: (A) that the process *as claimed* can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand; or (B) that the apparatus *as claimed* can be used to practice another materially different process." While this section provides possible reasons for a restriction requirement, it clearly contemplates that apparatuses and methods that use each other as claimed can be claimed in a single application. The claims that were recited in this application are believed to be such claims. Nonetheless, Applicant has decided to pursue only the method aspect of the invention in this application.

The method claims are explicitly restricted to embodiments of the apparatus disclosed in the application. Searching these method claims will necessarily include a search of the

DH-001

corresponding apparatuses used by the recited methods. Thus, searching and examining apparatus claims would impose little or no significant additional burden on the Examiner. In this regard, Applicant respectfully reminds the Examiner of the following requirement set forth in MPEP § 803: "If the search and examination of all the claims in an application can be made without serious burden, the examiner *must* examine them on the merits, even though they include claims to independent or distinct inventions" (emphasis added).

Despite the foregoing, Applicant is refraining from pursuing apparatus claims at this time in light of the Examiner's repeated restriction requirements. Applicant notes for the record, however, that the cancellation of the formerly pending apparatus claims is without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Applicant reserves the right to pursue apparatus claims corresponding to the new method claims upon allowance of those method claims, either in this application or in an application that claims priority from this application.

Turning to the correction of claim 15 required by the Office Action, Applicant's cancellation of that claim has rendered the required correction moot.

Art Rejections

The examined claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,672,621 (Moss) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,663,158 (Showalter). Moss is directed to a holding device for a book or binder. Showalter is directed to a golf cart bracket. Nothing in either of these references suggests any benefit of combining a book or binder holder with a golf cart bracket or vice

DH-001

versa. Applicant respectfully submits that this combination is nothing more than hindsight applied in view of Applicant's own disclosure, which is not a proper basis for a § 103 obviousness rejection.

In any case, this rejection has been rendered moot by Applicant's cancellation of the rejected claims.

Clearly, neither a book or binder holder nor a golf cart bracket is pertinent to the methods recited by the new claims. Thus, these claims are believed to be allowable over the applied art. See, e.g., MPEP § 2141.01(a).

Closing

The application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney can be reached at (614) 205-3241.

Respectfully submitted,



Dane C. Butzer
Reg. No. 43,521

Dated: January 4, 2006